Agenda Item Attachment 1

To request a Time Extension (TE) or Alternative Diversion Rectification (ADR), please complete and sign this form and return it to your Office of Local Assistance (OLA) representative at the factories below along with any additional information requested by OLA staff. When all documentation has been received, your OLA representative will work with you to prepare for your appearance before the Board. If you have any questions about this process, please call (916) 341-6199 to be connected to your OLA representative.

Mail completed documents to:

California Integrated Waste Management Board Office of Local Assistance, (MS 25) 1001 | Street PO Box 4025 Sacramento CA 95812-4025

AUG	31	2001	
			_

General Instructions:

For a Time Extension complete Sections I, II, III-A, IV-A, and V.

For an Alternative Diversion Requirement complete Sections I, II, III-B, IV-B and V.

Section I: Jurisdiction In All respondents must complete			on .				
I certify under penalty of perj and that I am authorized to n	ury that the	e information in this ertification on behal	document is true and f of:	correct to	the best of my knowledge.		
Jurisdiction Name		County					
City of Rocklin		Placer					
Authorized Signature	Title		Title				
Carlo A Chanter		hatea	City Manager				
Type/Print Name of Person Signing		Date	Phone				
Carlos A. Urrutia		8/31/01	(916) 632-4050		1050		
Person Completing This Form (please print or type)		ne)	Title				
Debra Plant		Assistant to the City Manager					
- Di-							
Pnone		E-mail Address		Fax	·		
(916)632-4050 debip@rocklin.ca.go		debip@rocklin.ca.gov		(916)624-8018			
Mailing Address	City		State		ZIP Code		
P.O. Box 1380	Rocklin		CA	:	95677		
Type/Print Name of Person Signing Cartos A. Urrutia Person Completing This Form (please Debra Plant Phone (916)632-4050 Mailing Address	se print or typ	Date 8/31/01 be) E-mail Address	City Manager Title Assistant to the City Ma	(916) 632 nager	2IP Code		

Section II—Cover Sheet	
This cover sheet is to be completed for each Time Extension (TE) or Alternative Divergence (ADR) requested.	rsion
1. Eligibility Has your jurisdiction filed its Source Reduction and Recycling Element, Household Hazardou Element, and Nondisposal Facility Element with the Board (must have been filed by July 1, 1 requesting an ADR)?	us Waste 998 if you are
No. If no. stop; not eligible for a TE or ADR.	
Yes. If yes, then eligible for a TE or ADR.	
2. Specific Request and Length of Request	
Please specify the request desired.	
Specific years requested _2001,2002,2003	
Is this a second request? No Yes Specific years requested(Note: Requests for an additional extension will need to address why the jurisdict meet the 50% goal by the end of the first extension were not successful.)	ion's efforts to
Alternative Diversion Requirement Request (Not allowed for Regional Agencies).	
Specific ADR requested%, for the years	
is this a second // is reduced.	or the
years	efforts to meet
Note: Extensions may be requested anytime by a jurisdiction, but will only be effective in the January 1, 2000 to January 1, 2006. An original request for a TE/ADR may be granted for at three years and subsequent requests for TE/ADR may extend the original request or be base circumstances but the total number of years for all requests cannot total more than five years beyond January 1, 2006.	ny period up to ed on new

Section IIIA—TIME EXTENSION

Within this section, discuss your jurisdiction's progress in implementing diversion programs that were planned to achieve 50%. Provide any additional information that demonstrates "good faith effort." The CIWMB shall determine your jurisdiction's progress in demonstrating "good faith effort" towards complying with AB 939. Note: The answers to each question should be comprehensive and provide specific details regarding the jurisdiction's situation.

Attach additional sheets if necessary—please reference each response to the appropriate cell number (e.g., IIIA-1).

- Why does your jurisdiction need more time to meet the 50% goal? Describe why SRRE selected
 programs did not achieve 50% diversion. Identify barriers to meeting the 50% goal and briefly indicate
 how they will be overcome.
- The City planned to meet the 50% diversion goal by the year 2000 as indicated in our SRRE. The cornerstone of our program was our newly built MRFwhich was slated to go on line in late 1994 but didn't become operational until late 1995. The expense and time we had put into our MRF generated a need for us to hold off on implementing some of our programs. We did not want to create programs that would be in direct opposition to the goals of our MRF. In 1995 our diversion was not quite 6 %, over the years, as the MRF has worked out the glitches in some of its systems and processes, we are now at 39% in the year 2000. Over the last year, steps have been taken to overcome inefficiences at the MRF. The County and the member cities in our JPA have contracted for reviews to be done of all the parties particiapting in the waste flow at the MRF as well as hiring marketing consultants to test our markets and recommend and implement marketing and educational programs to us. We expect to see further improvement in diversion from the MRF but not an additional 11%.
- To get to the 50% goal we will begin to implement a residential greenwaste curbside collection program in the 4th quarter of 2001. With this program we expect a minumum 11% increase in our diversion rate based on experiences in City's similar to ours. In the past, our greenwaste diversion has been allocated on a per capita basis amongst the JPA cities. Our new program will be structured so that we dump our greenwaste in a separate area for processing. This exclusive dumping process will allow us to receive 100% of our diversion. Additionally, no loss will occur as it has in the past, from co-mingling in the toters, or sifting through on the processing belts.
- 2. Why does your jurisdiction need the amount of time requested? Describe any relevant circumstances in the jurisdiction that contribute to the need for a Time Extension.
- We are asking for a three-year extension because we feel it will take this amount of time to have the program fully efficient. In 2001 we are finalizing administrative details, such as compost pad extensions, fee hearings, and contract amendments. In 2002, we anticipate a phasing in process to all of the residents in the City. We will be able to determine the effectiveness of our routes and the collection system and work through the process in a methodical and conservative manner so as to quarantee our long term success. The last year, 2003, we expect to have full implementation of the program and will have measurement information available to us. We will then fine tune our process and by year's end, have numbers that reflect a fully efficient system.
- 3. Describe your jurisdiction's Good Faith Efforts to implement the programs in its SRRE.

In all cases, we have demonstrated good faith effort in our SRRE programs. To the extent we had to keep our focus on the MRF, some of the programs we proposed have not been practical to implement. Most importantly, though, we have a 39% diversion rate from our efforts and have not had to go back and "recount" our base to get there. Additionally, we have been able to reduce rates at the MRF in recent years while increasing our diversion rates, a fact that our citizens fully embrace. Over the past year we have had all of our MRF contracts reviewed and suggested changes are being implemented. Also, we have conducted market tests and studies and have determined new "messages" and educational programs that will "speak" to our customers. Finally, the City has moved ahead on implementing a residential greenwaste curbside program and is in the final stages of negotiations and planning for a collection start date in last quarter 2001.

4. Provide any additional relevant information that supports the request.

No additional information.

Section IV A-PLAN OF CORRECTION

A Plan of Correction is required by PRC Section 41820(a)(6)(B). The plan is fundamentally a description of the actions the jurisdiction will take to meet the 50% goal by the expiration of the Time Extension.

Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Residenti	ial %		65	Non-resid	dential %		35
PROGRAM TYPE Please use the Board's Program Types. The Program Glossary is online at:	NEW or EXPAND		DESCRIPTION O	F PROGRAM	FUNDING SOURCE	DATE FUI COMPLE	ESTIMATED PERCENT DIVERSION
www.ciwmb.ca.gov/ LGCentral/PARIS/Codes/ Reduce.htm							
3000-CM-RCG	New	serve a Project will reco	II single family resident ed 12,000 households i	in 2002. Each residence pecifically allocated for	Waste Hauler Fees	2003	11%
7000-FR-MRF	Expand			peen executed to increase very at the MRF from 16 -	N/A	7/01/02	 2%
7000-FR-MRF	Expand			peen executed to increase wery at the MRF from 18%	N/A	7/01/03	2%
		Total Estimated Diversion Percent From New and/or Expanded Programs				 15%	
			Current Diversion	on Rate Percent From Late	st Annual Re	port	 39%
			Total PI	anned Diversion Percent 6	Estimated		 54%

PROGRAMS SUPPORTING DIVERSION ACTIVITIES

PROGRAM TYPE	NEW or EXPANDED	DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM	DATE FULLY COMPLETED	
6020-PI-OTH	New	Council decision to cease issuing burn permits in the City. This action came about because we now have the greenwaste program as a disposal mechanism. This action benefits air quality, and residential fire safety while creating more compostable materials for resale at the MRF.	7/01/02	
5020-ED-OUT	New	Outreach Promotion for greenwaste program will be conducted. Hauler will provide flier and door to door introduction of the service.	2002	
3020-CM-COG	New	When requested, hauler provides greenwaste debris boxes to commercial accounts at the County rate.	Ongoing	
1030-SR-PMT	New	Procurement Policy. City staff will present a procurement policy and resources needs analysis to the City Council for approval.	7/01/03	